

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/553,993	GUNDERSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BJ Forman	1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Vicki Norton. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 1634

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner informed Ms. Norton (Power of Attorney, filed 16 October 2002) that the previous Attorney of Record filed an amendment on 31 December 2002 (paper no. 23), which was subsequent to Ms. Norton's amendment of 2 December 2002 (paper no. 26). The examiner informed Ms. Norton that even though a change in power of attorney had been filed, the amendments of paper no. 26 are assumed by the office to be official under 37 C.F.R. 1.34(a) and have therefore been entered (see MPEP 404). The amendments of paper no. 23 and 26 amended Claim 14 as presented in paper no. 13. Because the amendment of paper no. 26 amends Claim 14 as presented in paper no. 13 and not as presented in paper no. 23, the amendments of paper no. 26 are incorrect and improper. The examiner informed Ms. Norton that absent a supplemental response, the amendments of paper no. 26 will be addressed and an Office Action will be mailed. The examiner suggested that the most efficient way to clarify the situation is to file a supplemental amendment which cancels Claim 14 and submits a new Claim 29 identical to the clean copy of Claim 14 presented in paper no. 23. Ms. Norton stated that the supplemental amendment would be submitted by FAX as suggested.